

**WASHINGTON STATE
WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD
MEETING NO. 109
March 16, 2006**

***HIGH SKILLS, HIGH WAGES 2006*
DRAFT CHAPTER 4
PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY**

This tab contains the first draft of the “Performance Accountability” chapter of *High Skills, High Wages 2006* (HSHW). The draft updates the chapter, which has been largely unchanged since HSHW 2000, and streamlines the performance measures. The chapter is the main statement of the Board’s policies on performance measurement and accountability for the workforce development system, including the Workforce Investment Act (WIA), Perkins, and the system as a whole. The chapter responds to the Board’s assignments established in 28C.18.060 RCW, Executive Order 99-02, WIA, and Perkins. Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board staff prepared the draft with the input of the interagency Performance Management for Continuous Improvement (PMCI) workgroup (see attachment for PMCI membership).

The draft chapter retains a lengthy list of core indicators that makes the accountability system somewhat cumbersome. There is hope that Congress will codify the Integrated Performance Information (IPI) measures as part of WIA and Perkins reauthorization. This should greatly reduce the number of performance measures. Pending the outcome of Congressional action, the draft recommends no changes to the core indicators.

The major changes that have made from the 2004 version are:

- The draft will add a figure to help clarify the performance accountability system.
- The draft streamlines and clarifies the performance accountability system by merging the “key measures” that were in the action plan chapter with the “systemwide indicators” that are in the performance accountability chapter and reducing the number of measures.
- The draft shortens the chapter by not listing the “program indicators” (formerly known as the “common indicators”).
- The table of performance results and targets for the core indicators is moved to an appendix.
- The draft adds a section on Government Management, Accountability, and Performance (GMAP).

There are a number of policy questions that the Board should consider in reviewing the draft. These questions include:

- Should performance targets be included for the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Services for the Blind, and Wagner-Peyser (Labor Exchange)?

- Should the largest increases in performance targets focus improvement efforts on employer satisfaction, participant earnings, and educational attainment, as opposed to other measures?
- Should there be any change to the WorkSource performance measures?
- Should Section 503 incentive grants still have the same policy parameters (e.g., allocated to Workforce Development Councils (WDCs) for system-wide initiatives only)?
- Should WDCs be required to engage in GMAP and/or apply for the Washington State Quality Award (as state agencies are required to)?

These questions do not have to be settled at this time. But the Board will need to decide these questions before adopting the final version of HSHW 2006.

Following Board review, staff will make changes requested by the Board and then widely disseminate the draft for further input.

Board Action Requested: Adoption of the recommended motion.

RECOMMENDED MOTION

WHEREAS, The state statutes for the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board require the Board to, “Establish standards for data collection and maintenance for the operating agencies of the state training system ...” and to, “Establish minimum standards for program evaluation for the operating agencies of the state training system,” and,

WHEREAS, Executive Order 99-02 requires the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board to, “Design and implement a performance management system for workforce development ...” and adds Wagner-Peyser, work-related components of the vocational rehabilitation program, and WorkSource, to the performance management system; and,

WHEREAS, The Workforce Investment Act requires the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, as the State Workforce Investment Board, to contain in the state plan “a description of the state performance accountability system developed for the workforce investment activities to be carried out through the statewide workforce investment system, that includes information identifying state performance measures ...” and,

WHEREAS, The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act requires the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, as the state eligible agency, to “ establish a state performance accountability system ... to assess the effectiveness of the state in achieving statewide progress in vocational and technical education, and to optimize the return of investment of federal funds in vocational and technical education activities,” and,

WHEREAS, Washington has created *High Skills, High Wages* as the strategic direction for the state unified plan for workforce development; and,

WHEREAS, Chapter four of *High Skills, High Wages* describes the performance accountability system for workforce development; and,

WHEREAS, State statutes require the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board to update the state strategic plan every two years, and Board staff have developed a first draft update of chapter four with the input of representatives of the affected state agencies and Workforce Development Councils;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board approve the dissemination of draft chapter 4 for public review and comment.

HIGH SKILLS, HIGH WAGES 2006

CHAPTER 4

Performance Accountability

In order to meet the combined challenges of the competitive economy, changing labor force, and to make the best use of increasingly scarce resources, the workforce development system must continuously improve its performance. What counts are results in meeting the needs of our customers—students, job seekers, workers, and employers. The workforce development system must continuously measure results, identify areas to improve, and make the necessary improvements.

Prior to the creation of *High Skills, High Wages*, Washington State did not have an accountability system for workforce development. What we had were separate accountability activities for many of our programs.

Because these accountability activities were developed in order to meet separate program missions and requirements, they did not add up to systemwide accountability. There were no agreed upon measurable goals for the system as a whole and no standards for collecting consistent data from agency to agency. Often, data collection focused on inputs rather than results. Some programs did not evaluate what happened to their participants once they left their program, nor did they use program results to guide improvements. This has all changed.

Performance Management for Continuous Improvement

*******Changes from 2004: Deletes most of the language on the history of PMCI and adds reference to IPI.*******

In January 1996, the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board) adopted the design for a new accountability system, “Performance Management for Continuous Improvement” (PMCI). Having a systemwide framework has many advantages, including increased accountability, improved strategic planning, better research, more efficient use of resources, and a sense of shared responsibility among workforce development programs. These advantages can improve the credibility of workforce programs and, in turn, enhance the support they receive and, ultimately, their ability to serve customers.

Based on Washington’s success with PMCI, the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) asked the Workforce Board in 2004 to lead the 50 states in the design of the next generation performance management system. The result is, *Integrated Performance Information for Workforce Development: A Blueprint for States* (IPI). Other states are implementing the IPI Blueprint and Congress is now considering the IPI performance measures as the standard for workforce development programs.

Congress is expected to reauthorize both WIA and Perkins during 2006. As part of reauthorization, Congress is reconsidering the measures to use for the federal core indicators. Options under consideration include the measures recommended in the IPI Blueprint; this could codify consistent measures across federal workforce programs. At the same time, DOL is moving forward with changes in some of the measures required for DOL programs, changes that may be temporary depending on how Congress acts. How these things will play out remains

uncertain at this time. *High Skills, High Wages: 2006* makes no changes to the state core indicators pending the outcome of these federal developments.

PMCI Overview

*****New section*****

The following figure presents an overview of the PMCI system from local to the most global measures:

Desired Outcomes for the Workforce Development System						
Competencies	Employment	Earnings	Productivity	Reduced Poverty	Customer Satisfaction	Return on Investment
↑	Workforce Development Systemwide Indicators					↑
↑	Program Indicators and State and Federal Core Indicators and Targets					↑
↑	Workforce Development Area Core Indicators and Targets					↑
↑	Consumer Report System on Local Provider Results					↑

Desired Outcomes for the Workforce Development System

PMCI identifies seven desired outcomes for the workforce development system as a whole. These outcomes focus on the difference workforce development makes in the lives of program participants, their families, and their communities. These outcomes are not static targets, but conditions that should be increasingly true for all people. Results on indicators of these outcomes should be measured for the population as a whole and separately for women, people of color, and people with disabilities.

- **Competencies:** Washington's workforce possesses the skills and abilities required in the workplace.
- **Employment:** Washington's workforce finds employment opportunities.
- **Earnings:** Washington's workforce achieves a family wage standard of living from earned income.
- **Productivity:** Washington's workforce is productive.
- **Reduced Poverty:** Washington's workforce lives above poverty.

- **Customer Satisfaction:** Workforce development participants and their employers are satisfied with workforce development services and results.
- **Return on Investment:** Workforce development programs provide returns that exceed program costs.

Workforce Development Systemwide Indicators

*******Changes: The following section combines indicators that were in this section before and the “key” or “governor’s” indicators that were in chapter five and reduces the total number of indicators.*******

In order to measure Washington’s progress in achieving these outcomes, PMCI includes systemwide indicators. Some of these are measures of the state’s whole workforce, not just individuals who have gone through the programs. We want to know how well the whole state is doing, not just the part of our population who have been program participants.

No single quantitative measure can accurately depict the results for any of the desired outcomes. Each measure is an indicator of how well the state is doing. Viewed in isolation they might be misleading, but together they paint a descriptive picture. The Workforce Board will report the results each year in *Measuring Our Progress*. By most indicators, we have made substantial improvement in recent years.

Systemwide Indicators and Most Recently Available Results

Competencies

- Percentage of students entering ninth grade class who graduate with their class: 66 percent in 2002; 70 percent in 2004.
- The number of community and technical college students, private career school students, and apprentices prepared for work compared to the number of net job openings for workers at that education level: 77 percent in 2000; ____ in 2004.
- Percentage of workforce training participants who report their job-specific skills improved a lot: 69 percent for 2000 participants; ____ percent for 2004.
- Percentage of employed former workforce training participants who report their training was related to the job held nine months after leaving their program: 83 percent for 2000 participants; ____ percent for 2004.

Employment

- The number of new jobs created in Washington per year (does not include agricultural jobs, the count for which is unavailable): 62,600 in 2000; ____ in 2005.

- Percentage of workforce development program participants self-reporting employment six to nine months after leaving their program: 79 percent for 2000 participants; ____ percent for 2004.

Earnings

- Mean annual earnings of Washington workers (stated in constant dollars in order to control for inflation): \$ ____ in 2000; \$ ____ in 2005.
- Annual earnings of workforce development program participants six to nine months after leaving their program (stated in constant dollars in order to control for inflation): \$ ____ for 2000 participants; \$ ____ for 2004 participants.
- The ratio of dislocated workers' earnings after program participation compared to their earnings prior to dislocation: 94 percent for 2000 participants; and ____ percent for 2004 participants.

Productivity

- Annual gross business income per worker in Washington (stated in constant dollars in order to control for inflation): \$ ____ in 2000; \$ ____ in 2004.

Poverty

- The number of Washington residents living in poverty for every 100 U.S. residents living in poverty: ____ in 2000; ____ in 2005
- Among workforce development participants starting below the poverty line, the percentage with personal earnings above the poverty line during the second year after leaving their program: 50 percent for 2000 participants; ____ percent for 2002 participants.

Customer Satisfaction

- Percentage of former workforce training participants satisfied with program services and results: 91 percent for 2000 participants; ____ percent for 2004.
- Percentage of WorkSource customers who report the state did an excellent or good job in making the programs easy to use: 78 percent in 2002; ____ percent in 2005.
- Percentage of Washington employers satisfied with the overall quality of former training participants' work: 89 percent in 2001; ____ percent in 2005.
- Percentage of Washington employers using WorkSource: 7.1 percent in 2001; ____ percent in 2005.

Return on Investment

- The average ratio of training participants' net gain in earnings and benefits (projected to aged 65) to program public costs: \$4.1 to \$1 for 2000 participants; ____ for 2004 participants.

Program Indicators

*******Changes: The following section changes the name from “common indicators” to “program indicators” in order to avoid confusion with the federal use of the term “common indicators.” Deletes the listing of the program indicators. The reader can look at *Workforce Training Results* to see them.*******

Individual workforce development programs, such as secondary career and technical education, Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Title I-B, and apprenticeship each contribute to the desired outcomes for the system. In order to measure the participant results of the programs, PMCI has identified a large number of performance indicators that can be used to measure most workforce development programs.

The Workforce Board uses the program indicators every two years in producing the report, *Workforce Training Results*. The primary purpose of the report, and the program indicators, is to inform continuous improvement in state level policies. All the indicators are “outcome” as opposed to “process” indicators, and all focus on outcomes for program participants. The focus is on what is good for the customers.

The program indicators and the methodology for measuring them are not permanent. They are continually evolving as we learn more from the research, and as the data capacity of programs improves. The PMCI framework endeavors to use indicators that apply, for the most part, across workforce development programs. While the goal is to have consistent indicators and methodology across programs, there remain some differences among programs due to differences in data capability. There are also some differences in the indicators among programs because of differences in the populations served and the purposes of the programs. For instance, an indicator for programs that serve dislocated workers is earnings replacement. Such an indicator does not make sense for measuring programs that provide initial workforce preparation to youth.

The methodology for measuring results relies as much as possible on administrative records as opposed to program staff or participant self-reports. This data source is used in order to enable as much consistency and objectivity across programs as possible. To measure employment and earnings, the methodology takes advantage of the unemployment insurance (UI) wage files maintained by the Employment Security Department (ESD) (and the equivalent agency in other states). These files hold information on all employment covered by the UI system—approximately 95 percent of all employment.

Another important feature of the methodology is the use of the time period of seven to nine months after a participant has left his or her program as the key period for measuring post program results. The Workforce Board and its partner agencies have reviewed the actual results for each post program quarter for three and a half years following program exit for five of the largest workforce development programs. We found that the third post program quarter is the

best possible single representation of the programs' relative and lasting results without waiting years to obtain long-term results.

State Core Indicators

State core indicators are a small subset of the program indicators that serve purposes in addition to informing continuous improvement in state-level policies. Core indicators are important for motivating desired behavior by program administrators and staff and for unifying workforce development programs around common purposes. Like the rest of the program indicators, they are also important for providing consistent measures so that, for example “the percentage employed” means the same thing from one program to another.

The Workforce Board uses the state core indicators to measure results of statewide programs such as secondary career and technical education in the state, the results of local workforce development councils, and the results of individual providers such as particular colleges. These are the indicators, along with federal mandatory indicators for which the Board sets numerical performance standards for statewide and area results. The Workforce Board measures performance against these standards to determine performance-based consequences: incentives, sanctions, or other intervention actions.

Employment or Further Education of Former Program Participants

- a. **Programs serving adults:** Percentage of former participants with employment recorded in UI and other administrative records during the third quarter after leaving the program.
- b. **Programs serving youth:** Percentage of former participants with employment or further education as recorded in UI, student, and other administrative records during the third quarter after leaving the program.

Earnings of Former Program Participants

- a. **Programs serving adults:** Median annualized earnings of former participants with employment recorded in UI wage records during the third quarter after leaving the program, measured only among the former participants not enrolled in further education during the quarter.
- b. **Programs serving youth:** Median annualized earnings of former participants with employment recorded in UI wage records during the third quarter after leaving the program, measured only among the former participants not enrolled in further education during the quarter.

Educational Attainment of Program Participants

Percentage or number of program participants leaving the program that year who achieved appropriate skill gains or were awarded the relevant educational or skill credential based on administrative records.

Employer Satisfaction With Former Program Participants

Percentage of employers who report satisfaction with new employees who are program completers as evidenced by survey responses.

(Note: This indicator is to be measured at the state level and is not required as an indicator for local education institutions. The Workforce Board will not survey a sufficient sample of former employers to measure satisfaction with each school or college.)

Former Participant Satisfaction

Percentage of former participants who report satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses.

(Note: This indicator is to be measured at the state and area level and is not required as an indicator for local education institutions.)

Federal Core Indicators and State Additional Indicators

*******Adds language about IPI, reauthorization, and the new DOL indicators*******

The federal Carl Perkins Act and WIA specify certain mandatory indicators of program results. Mandatory federal core indicators are different for each program. States have the discretion to identify additional state indicators. The identification of additional state indicators enables the state to have some indicators of performance that are consistent across programs and allows states to focus on results they deem truly important and informative to policymakers and program administrators alike. The above state core indicators are additional state indicators for Washington when they do not duplicate federal indicators.

Performance Targets for Core Indicators

The Workforce Board identifies expected levels of performance on each of the state and federal core indicators. The federal WIA and the Carl Perkins Act refer to these standards as adjusted levels of performance. These expected levels of performance are for secondary and postsecondary vocational education, WIA Title I-B, and WIA Title II-Adult Education and Family Literacy. In future modifications of the strategic and operational plans, additional programs of the workforce development system will be added to this process.

*******Note Policy Question: What programs if any should be added to those for which the Workforce Board sets performance targets? Under E.O. 99-02 the Workforce Board was to include WIA Titles II and IV in its performance accountability system.*******

The Workforce Board identifies performance targets based upon past performance and expectations for future improvement. The expected level of performance is not the same for each program. Programs serve different populations for different purposes. Programs that serve youth, for example, should not be expected to have the same performance as programs serving adults. Also, the expected increase is not the same for each indicator. Some areas of performance are more difficult to change than others. In some areas, programs are already performing at or near peak levels, so little if any improvement can be expected, while in other areas, substantial

improvements can and should be made. The Workforce Board's performance targets for the future emphasize improving employer satisfaction, participant earnings, and educational attainment.

*******Note Policy Question: Are these still the outcomes that the Board wants to focus on for improvement?*******

The Workforce Board sets the targets for the state indicators and negotiates and reaches agreement on the targets for the federal indicators with DOL for WIA and the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) for Perkins.

The appendix to this chapter shows the federal and state indicators for career and technical education, WIA Title I-B, and Adult Education and Literacy. Included in the tables are the actual results for the last three years and the expected levels of performance for the next two years. Performance, of course, is affected by the demographic characteristics of program participants and economic conditions. Should the economic conditions and demographic characteristics change in the future, the Workforce Board will revise the performance targets on the state indicators and negotiate revisions with DOE and DOL for Perkins and WIA Title I, respectively.

Local Area Performance

Strategic and Operational Performance Indicators

Local workforce development councils use performance indicators for strategic planning for the area's workforce development system as a whole, and operationally in their role as overseers of WorkSource and WIA Title I-B.

For strategic planning purposes, the Workforce Board provides local councils with performance of area programs on the program indicators discussed in this chapter. These performance results should inform councils of program strengths and opportunities for improvement. The results are also available to participants and stakeholders in the system. Local strategic plans contain strategies to effect these improvements.

Under WIA, local councils are directly responsible for the performance of WorkSource operators and WIA Title I-B. The most critical indicators of performance are the state and federal core indicators identified in this chapter.

Local Performance Targets for Core Indicators

*******The following subsection has been updated to describe what we have actually been doing.*******

The Workforce Board establishes performance targets on each of the state and federal core indicators for WIA Title I-B for the local workforce development councils. The expected levels of performance depend on local economic and other conditions and the demographic characteristics of participants served. In order to adjust expected local levels of performance for such factors, the Workforce Board applies multiple regression models. So for example, the Board lowers the performance targets for a local area to the extent that its program participants have demographic characteristics that are harder to serve than the state average. The local council and

Chief Local Elected Official(s) may request to negotiate performance targets with the state Workforce Board and introduce data not considered by the models.

WorkSource Performance

WorkSource Participant Population

Local councils also use performance information in overseeing the area WorkSource system. WorkSource participants include individuals and employers who receive services through a WorkSource Center or an affiliate site providing services funded under WIA Title I, WIA Title III (Wagner-Peyser), or the state's WorkFirst program's employment-related services. Participants in other programs are counted for a particular service when the program dedicates resources for that service to WorkSource. Together, these populations are considered the WorkSource participant population for purposes of accountability.

WorkSource Performance Measures

For registered participants, the Workforce Board supplies each local council with the results on all of the state and federal core indicators listed for WIA Title I.

The Workforce Board uses additional indicators to measure performance of WorkSource in serving all participants, not just participants who register. The following are these indicators:

- Percentage of employers using WorkSource services
- Percentage of total workers using WorkSource services
- Customer perception of seamlessness
- Staff perception of seamlessness
- Number of students who are WorkSource participants

Consumer Report System

The Workforce Board operates a consumer report system of training provider results, as well as course descriptions and other key information for potential students (www.jobtrainingresults.org). The consumer report system presents information on individual programs of study at individual institutions. For example, the network administrator program at college X. Information includes student characteristics, employment and earnings of former students, and where to learn more about the college and the program.

The consumer report system also includes the state Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL) www.wtb.wa.gov/etp. This is the list of training programs that are eligible to train students funded by WIA Individual Training Accounts or dislocated workers receiving extended UI benefits under the state's Training Benefits Program. To be on the list, a training program must satisfy the Workforce Board's performance criteria. Each year, the Workforce Board establishes minimum standards that programs must meet for completion rates, employment rates, and earnings of former students. The ETPL identifies the training programs that meet the standards.

Performance Based Consequences

System Level

WIA authorizes incentive funding for states that exceed the “adjusted levels of performance” in WIA Title I-B, Adult Education and Family Literacy and Career and Technical Education. A state that achieves 100 percent on the average for all the federal core indicators for each program is considered to have exceeded the adjusted levels of performance, so long as performance does not fall below 80 percent on any indicator.

When Washington State receives such an incentive award, the state allocates the funds to local areas that exceeded their expected level of performance in these programs, including performance on the state core indicators, as well as on the federal core indicators. The Workforce Board identifies the size of the award for each year, and ESD allocates the funds. The funds must be used for system building activities, not activities that pertain only to a particular program, i.e., WIA Title I-B, Adult Education and Family Literacy, or Vocational Education.

Program Level

For WIA Title I-B, the Governor earmarks a portion of the state set aside to reward local areas that exceed 100 percent of the average of the expected levels of performance for the state and federal core indicators. ESD allocates these funds to local areas.

If the state fails to meet the adjusted levels of performance on the federal core indicators for WIA Title I-B for two consecutive years, DOL can withhold up to five percent of the state’s WIA Title I-B funds. DOL considers states to have failed to meet the levels if performance falls below 80 percent of the target levels.

If a local area fails to achieve 80 percent average performance across the state and federal core indicators for WIA Title I-B, ESD will require the local council to submit either a performance improvement plan or a modified local plan to the state. If such failure continues for a second consecutive year, the Governor may require the development of a reorganization plan. If the state is sanctioned by DOL for poor performance, ESD will withhold a proportional amount of funds from local areas based on their average performance across the state and federal core indicators.

To be eligible to receive funding under WIA Title I-B, all training providers must meet the performance standards established by the Workforce Board and local workforce development councils. If a training provider fails to meet the standards for any one year, the provider will not be an eligible provider of WIA Title I-B funded training for the year beginning the first quarter after the substandard performance is reported.

Under the Carl Perkins Act, if the state fails to meet the “adjusted levels of performance” the “state eligible agency,” which is the Workforce Board, must develop and implement a program improvement plan in consultation with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC), and other partners. If the state fails to meet the levels of performance for a second consecutive year, DOE may withhold all or a portion of Carl Perkins Act funds from the state.

If the state is sanctioned by DOE for poor performance, the Workforce Board will reduce the allocation of funds to the secondary and/or postsecondary systems proportional to the sanction and to the extent that the secondary and/or postsecondary systems contributed to the poor results.

If a college or school district is not making substantial progress in achieving the expected levels of performance, SBCTC or OSPI, on behalf of the Workforce Board, will assess what is needed to overcome the performance deficiencies, approve a local improvement plan, and conduct regular evaluations of progress.

If the Workforce Board allocation of the Carl Perkins Act funds to its secondary or postsecondary system is reduced due to federal sanctions, OSPI and SBCTC will determine the resulting impact on school districts and colleges, respectively, and allocate the funds accordingly.

SBCTC/Office of Adult Literacy has identified similar performance-based interventions for Adult and Family Literacy applications.

Measuring and Reporting Results

Data Collection

*******The data elements in the following section will need to be reviewed for consistency with SKIES, and changes need to be made in either SKIES, the list of data elements, or both.*******

The Workforce Board provides information on the results of secondary and postsecondary Career and Technical Education; WIA Title I-B; work related Adult Education and Family Literacy. and other workforce development programs; and the WorkSource One-Stop system to the appropriate federal agencies, state policymakers, and local workforce development councils. To accomplish this, the Workforce Board ensures that participant data from each of these programs and from WorkSource are collected and matched with administrative records for the purpose of measuring the common and core indicators. The Workforce Board also conducts participant and employer surveys for these programs and for WorkSource and provides area level breakdowns of the results.

The specific data source(s) for participant records for each program is identified in the program's operating plan.

For WorkSource participants, the Services, Knowledge and Information Exchange System (SKIES) collects and maintains data. The following figure shows the data elements, at a minimum, that are to be collected and recorded for all WorkSource participants who request services other than self-service or information only services.

Common Data Elements That are Collected at Intake on Program Participants

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 1. Date | 2. First Name | 3. Last Name |
| 4. Phone/FAX/E-Mail | 5. Address | 6. Social Security # |
| 7. Services Requested | 8. Gender M/F | 9. Limited English Y/N |
| 10. Date of Birth | | |
11. Disability Status—Do you have a physical or mental impairment that:
- a. Limits the kind or amount of work you can do at a job? Y/N
 - b. Prevents you from working at a job? Y/N
12. What is your highest grade completed?
- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22+
13. What is the highest level of certification or degree you have achieved?
- High school diploma
 - GED
 - Some schooling after high school but no degree or certificate
 - Vocational certificate/diploma
 - Two-year Associates Vocational Degree
 - Two-year Associates Academic degree
 - Bachelors degree
 - Graduate degree
 - Other
14. With which racial group do you most closely identify? For selection of specific choices, use current U.S. Census elements.
15. Intake Location
16. Currently Employed? Y/N
17. U.S. Veteran: Y/N
18. Displaced Homemaker: Y/N
19. Out-of-School Youth: Y/N
20. Family Size
21. Receive Public Cash Assistance: Y/N

*******Change: the following paragraph has been changed to delete reference to Participant Outcomes Data Consortium.*******

The Workforce Board, SBCTC, ESD, and OSPI oversee a shared system for matching participant records with other administrative records, including UI wage records and college and university student enrollment records. Washington uses this process for measuring the performance indicators that are based on administrative record matches. Using the shared matching system ensures that common methodological protocols are applied in calculating the results of workforce development programs.

For survey-based research, the Workforce Board and its partner agencies have identified a pool of common survey questions. There are two pools of questions: one for individual participants and one for employers. The questions form the content of the Workforce Board's survey research. The questions also are a pool from which other workforce development programs and agencies may draw when surveying individuals or employers about their program experience or outcomes. The use of the common questions helps to ensure consistency in survey-based research throughout the system.

Training providers that want to offer training funded through Individual Training Accounts authorized under WIA Title I-B are required to submit cost and participant data to the Workforce Board. The Workforce Board uses the data matching system to match the participant records against other administrative records in order to measure provider performance. Provider performance is calculated for each field of study the provider wants to be eligible for Title I-B funding. The Workforce Board uses this data in establishing the required levels of provider performance, discussed earlier in this chapter, for providers to be placed on the list of eligible providers for WIA Title I-B funded training.

Performance Reports

The following figure shows the schedule of Workforce Board reports on the performance of the workforce development system and programs.

Workforce Board Performance Reports

Name of Report	Frequency	Subject
<i>WIA Title I-B Quarterly Report</i>	Quarterly	WIA Title I-B: Report to DOL on the performance of the state and local workforce development areas on WIA Title I-B on federal and state core indicators.
<i>WIA Title I-B Annual Report</i>	Annual	WIA Title I-B: Report to DOL on the performance of the state and local workforce development areas on WIA Title I-B
<i>Consolidated Annual Report</i>	Annual	Career and Technical Education: Report to DOE on the performance of secondary and postsecondary career and technical education
<i>Measuring our Progress</i>	Annual	Systemwide Indicators: Report on the state's performance on the workforce development systemwide indicators
<i>Workforce Training Results</i>	Biennial	Major Program Results: Report on the performance of the major workforce development programs
<i>Workforce Focus</i>	Biennial	Target Populations: Report on the performance of the major workforce development programs in serving target populations

Government Management, Accountability, and Performance

*******This section has been updated to include GMAP. The language on Baldrige Quality Assessment is unchanged.*******

In 2005, Governor Gregoire issued Executive Order 05-02 to establish a comprehensive government management, accountability, and performance system (GMAP). GMAP is a management system that focuses on measuring performance, regularly and frequently reporting results, quickly identifying problem areas, and identifying and implementing solutions. As stated in the Executive Order:

GMAP calls upon the Governor and other agency leaders to:

1. Take personal responsibility and hold the agency and its management accountable for results.
2. Use strategies that work, and make corrections when they don't.
3. Base decisions not on guesswork or preference but on accurate, up-to-date information.
4. Make decisions timely.
5. Follow up to make sure there's implementation after a decision has been made.
6. Take risks and learn from mistakes.
7. Communicate clearly to citizens about results.

GMAP will require each agency to:

1. Develop clear, relevant and easy-to-understand measures that show whether or not programs are successful.
2. Demonstrate how programs contribute to the priorities that are important to citizens.
3. Gather, monitor, and analyze program data.
4. Evaluate the effectiveness of programs.
5. Hold regular problem-solving sessions within the agency to improve performance.
6. Allocate resources based on strategies that work.
7. Regularly report to the Governor on their performance.

Governor Gregoire also requested House Bill (HB) 1970, which was passed by the Legislature. HB 1970 codifies GMAP in state statutes and extends its coverage to all state agencies, including higher education institutions and agencies headed by other elected officials. As a result, all agencies that are part of the workforce development system are now implementing GMAP.

Agencies have identified key performance measures, are tracking the results, and holding regular management meetings to fix problems.

The GMAP measures and the measures in this chapter are complimentary. The measures in the PMCI system provide consistent information across programs on their longer-term results. This is very useful information to elected officials and agency leaders for policy initiatives, strategic planning, and other efforts. GMAP, on the other hand, provides measures that are more real-time and more useful to the managers on the ground as they make day-to-day decisions on program operations.

HB 1970 also continues and expands upon the efforts earlier established by Governor Locke to bring Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence to state government. HB 1970 requires each agency, no later than 2008, to apply at least once every three years to the “Washington State Quality Award, or a similar organization, for an independent assessment of its quality management, accountability and performance system.” The assessment will evaluate the Baldrige categories of: leadership, strategic planning, customer focus, analysis and information, employee performance management, and process improvement. “The purpose of the assessment is to recognize best practice and identify improvement opportunities.”

Consistent with HB 1970 and WIA’s call for continuous quality improvement, the WorkSource system has widely implemented quality principles. In order to be initially certified during 1999, the state required each WorkSource center and affiliate site to complete a self-assessment based upon the quality categories of the Malcolm Baldrige Criteria. In addition to the self-assessment, WorkSource operators were required to sign a statement that confirms a commitment to continuous quality improvement and focus on priority areas of need.

Such quality efforts are expected to continue in the future. Under WIA, each local area must provide in its local WIA Title I-B plan, “a description of how the local board will ensure the continuous improvement of eligible providers of services through the system (the one-stop delivery system) and ensure that such providers meet the employment needs of local employers and participants.”

In order to meet this requirement, local councils are encouraged to continue to conduct annual self-assessments using a tool that uses the Malcolm Baldrige Quality Criteria. The self-assessment process should involve all partner programs staff involved in WorkSource centers. Measurements of the business results should include the state and federal core indicators for WIA Title I-B.

A critical part of quality improvement is customer focus. WorkSource centers and affiliates should measure customer satisfaction during the time of service and at the time of exit from service. This information should be used to improve the day-to-day operation of WorkSource.

Closing

*******The Closing deletes reference to the “key measures” that no longer appear in the final chapter but are instead incorporated in this chapter in the list of systemwide indicators.*******

The next chapter of *High Skills, High Wages* sets forth the key goals, objectives, and strategies for the workforce development system in Washington. The success of that action plan will be evidenced by the results of the performance accountability system that has been described in this chapter.

APPENDIX

***** Note: the following tables will be updated later with new federal measures and new results and targets.*****

State and Federal Core Indicators

S = State Core Indicator

F = Federal Core Indicator

	Performance			Targets	
	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
WIA Measures – Youth					
Educational Attainment (S) - Percentage of participants who obtained an appropriate credential.	46.5%	51.4%	67.6%	67.0%	69.0%
Credential Attainment (a) (F) - Among former participants, the percentage who attained a high school diploma or GED (younger youth). Measured for those not in high school at exit.	46.1%	64.9%	63.8%	52.0%	53.0%
Credential Attainment (b) (F) - Among former training participants, the percentage who completed education or training (older youth). Measured for only those who were employed.	46.4%	44.6%	52.7%	45.0%	46.0%
Younger Youth Skills (F) - Percentage of skill goals set for youth aged 14-18 that are attained within one year.	87.5%	70.6%	82.8%	73.0%	75.0%
Employment or Further Education (a) (S) - Percentage of former participants who were employed, in the military, or enrolled in education or training during the third quarter after the program (all youth).	59.3%	79.8%	72.0%	68.0%	70.0%
Employment or Further Education (b) (F) - Percentage of former participants who were employed, in the military, or enrolled in education or training during the third quarter after the program (younger youth).	57.6%	57.8%	63.8%	58.5%	59.0%
Entered Employment (OY) (F) - Percentage of older youth not employed at program registration who were employed during the first quarter after exiting the program.	67.9%	69.2%	71.5%	70.0%	70.5%
Retention in Employment (OY) (F) - Percentage of older youth who entered employment during the first quarter after exiting the program who were employed during the third post program quarter.	78.0%	76.6%	79.6%	78.0%	78.0%
Annualized Earnings (S) (2003 Dollars) - Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education were counted for this indicators.)	\$7,557	\$7,237	\$9,231	\$8,881	\$9,325
Earnings Gain (OY) (F) - Difference between earnings in the second and third quarters after exit and the second and third quarters before registration for older youth.	\$3,186	\$2,850	\$2,625	\$2,850	\$2,900

	Performance			Targets	
WIA Measures – Youth	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
Employer Satisfaction (S) - Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the Workforce Board. (Not required below the state level. Not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	72.8%	N.A.	83.1%	N.A.	
Employer Satisfaction (F) - Employer satisfaction with services they directly received as evidenced by responses to survey questions after service completion. (Not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	67.6	68.1	67.8	68.0	69.0
Participant Satisfaction (S) - Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program.	94.6%	N.A.	94.1%	94.0%	94.0%
Participant Satisfaction (F) - Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program.	76.4	75.9	75.0	75.0	75.0
Educational Attainment (S) - Percentage of completers who obtained an appropriate credential.	39.7%	62.6%	62.4%	63.0%	65.0%
Credential Attainment (F) - Among former training participants, the percentage who became employed and completed training.	66.3%	66.0%	70.4%	68.0%	69.0%
Employment (S) - Percentage of former participants who were employed during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants, not enrolled in further education, were counted for this indicator.)	68.2%	66.1%	74.5%	74.0%	75.0%

	Performance			Targets	
WIA Measures – Adults	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
Entered Employment (F) - Percentage of participants not employed at program registration who were employed during the first quarter after exiting the program.	72.1%	74.8%	80.7%	75.0%	75.5%
Retention in Employment (F) - Percentage of participants who entered employment during the first quarter after exiting the program who were employed during the third post program quarter.	81.7%	79.4%	83.8%	81.0%	82.0%
Annualized Earnings (S) (2003 Dollars) - Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education were counted for this indicator.)	\$15,848	\$16,436	\$18,174	\$18,714	\$19,276

	Performance			Targets	
WIA Measures – Adults	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
Earnings Gain (F) - Difference between earnings in the second and third quarters after exit and two quarters of preregistration earnings (based on average earnings in the four quarters before registration).	\$4,156	\$3,752	\$3,894	\$3,600	\$3,750
Employer Satisfaction (S) - Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the Workforce Board. (Not required below the state level. Not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	72.8%	N.A.	83.1%	N.A.	
Employer Satisfaction (F) - Employer satisfaction with services they directly received as evidenced by responses to survey questions after service completion. (Not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	67.6	68.1	67.8	68.0	69.0
Participant Satisfaction (S) - Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program.	85.8%	N.A.	90.6%	90.0%	90.0%
Participant Satisfaction (F) - Participant satisfaction with services as evidenced by responses to survey questions. (Not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	76.4	75.9	75.0	75.0	75.0

	Performance			Targets	
WIA Measures – Dislocated Workers	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
Educational Attainment (S) - Percentage of completers who obtained an appropriate credential.	46.3%	71.8%	64.8%	70.0%	72.0%
Credential Attainment (F) - Among former training participants, the percentage who became employed and completed training.	71.5%	71.9%	67.5%	70.0%	71.0%

	Performance			Targets	
WIA Measures – Dislocated Workers	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
Employment (S) - Percentage of former participants who were employed during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants, not enrolled in further education, were counted for this indicator.)	76.4%	78.3%	79.7%	80.0%	80.0%
Entered Employment (F) - Percentage of participants who were employed during the first quarter after exiting the program.	78.1%	81.8%	80.6%	78.5%	79.0%
Retention in Employment (F) - Percentage of participants who entered employment during the first quarter after exiting the program who were employed during the third post program quarter.	90.1%	90.6%	91.1%	90.5%	91.0%

	Performance			Targets	
WIA Measures – Dislocated Workers	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
Annualized Earnings (S) (2003 Dollars) - Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education were counted for this indicator.)	\$24,574	\$26,180	\$26,470	\$28,361	\$29,212
Earnings Gain (F) - Ratio of earnings during the second and third quarters after exit divided by earnings in the second and third quarters before job dislocation.	91.2%	88.2%	83.2%	86.0%	86.0%
Employer Satisfaction (S) - Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the Workforce Board. (Not required below the state level. Not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	72.8%	N.A.	83.1%	N.A.	
Employer Satisfaction (F) - Employer satisfaction with services they directly received as evidenced by responses to survey questions after service completion. (Not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	67.6	68.1	67.8	68.0	69.0
Participant Satisfaction (S) - Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program.	86.9%	N.A.	89.5%	89.0%	89.0%
Participant Satisfaction (F) - Participant satisfaction with services as evidenced by responses to survey questions. (Not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	76.4	75.9	75.0	75.0	75.0

	Performance			Targets	
Secondary Vocational Education Measures	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
Educational Attainment (F, S) - Percentage of completers who obtained an appropriate credential.	92.8%	94.9%	92.0%	93.2%	93.2%
Nontraditional Education/Training (a) (F) - Percentage of students who participated in vocational career education programs that lead to nontraditional employment for their gender.	38.5%	42.0%	37.7%	37.8%	37.8%
Nontraditional Education/Training (b) (F) - Percentage of students who completed vocational career education programs that lead to nontraditional employment for their gender.	38.8%	38.8%	31.5%	33.1%	33.1%
Employment or Further Education (F, S) - Percentage of completers who were employed, in the military, or enrolled in further education or training during the third quarter after leaving.	73.4%	75.8%	74.4%	71.6%	72.1%

	Performance			Targets	
Secondary Vocational Education Measures	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
Earnings (2003 Dollars) (S) - Median annualized earnings of completers during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education were counted for this indicator.)	\$10,613	\$10,613	\$10,424	\$10,529	\$10,634
Employer Satisfaction with Participants (S) - Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the Workforce Board. (Not required below the state level.)	81.3%	N.A.	81.6%	N.A.	80.0%
Participant Satisfaction (S) - Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program. (Not required below the state level.)	97.0%	N.A.	95.7%	N.A.	95.0%

	Performance			Targets	
Postsecondary Vocational Education Measures	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
Educational Attainment (S) – Number of participants prepared for the workforce.	18,973	20,889	22,319	20,300	22,600
Educational Attainment (F) – Percentage of participants prepared for the workforce.	57.3%	56.5%	56.5%	58.3%	58.5%
Nontraditional Education/Training (a) (F) – Percentage of students who participated in vocational career education programs that lead to nontraditional employment for their gender.	19.3%	20.1%	20.4%	19.3%	19.3%
Nontraditional Education/Training (b) (F) – Percentage of students who completed vocational career education programs that lead to nontraditional employment for their gender.	18.2%	18.6%	17.6%	18.6%	18.6%

	Performance			Targets	
Postsecondary Vocational Education Measures	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
Employment or Further Education (F, S) – Percentage of former participants who were employed, in the military, or enrolled in further education or training during the third quarter after leaving.	76.9%	76.9%	75.1%	72.4%	72.9%
Employment Retention (F) – Percentage of participants who entered employment during the first quarter after exiting the program who were employed during the third post program quarter.	76.1%	76.1%	73.7%	71.7%	72.2%
Earnings (S) (2003 Dollars) – Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education were counted for this indicator.)	\$22,894	\$22,466	\$21,525	\$21,740	\$21,958

	Performance			Targets	
Postsecondary Vocational Education Measures	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
Employer Satisfaction with Participants (S) – Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the Workforce Board. (Not required below the state level.)	88.1%	N.A.	91.1%	N.A.	90.0%
Participant Satisfaction (S) – Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program. (Not required below the state level.)	91.8%	N.A.	87.2%	N.A.	91.0%

	Performance			Targets	
Adult Basic Education Measures	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	(Year 5)
Educational Attainment (F) - Percentage of adults enrolled in basic literacy programs who completed a level of instruction.	33%	41%	48%	35%	50%
Literacy Gains (F) - Percentage of adults enrolled in English Literacy programs who demonstrated improvements in English language skill level.	39%	42%	48%	34%	50%
High School Completion (F) - Percentage of adult learners with a high school completion goal who earned a high school diploma or GED.	25%	25%	22%	42%	23%
Entered Postsecondary Education or Training (F) - Percentage of adult learners with the goal to continue their education who enter postsecondary education or training.	60%	31%	93%	60%	33%
Entered Employment (F) - Percentage of adult unemployed learners with an employment goal who were employed at the end of the first quarter after they exited the program.	31%	44%	19%	32%	20%
Retained Employment (F) - Percentage of adult learners with a job retention goal at enrollment or employed in the quarter after exit who were employed in the third quarter after leaving.	80%	77%	42%	63%	44%
Employment (S) - Percentage of former participants who were employed or in the military during the third quarter after leaving.	60%	N.A.	55%	56%	56%
Annualized Earnings (S) (2003 Dollars) - Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education were counted in this indicator.)	\$15,804	N.A.	\$15,104	\$15,255	\$15,406

	Performance				Targets	
Adult Basic Education Measures	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)		(Year 4)	(Year 5)
<i>Employer Satisfaction with Participants</i> (S) - Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the Workforce Board. (Not required below the state level.)	77.2%	N.A.	87.5%		N.A.	89%
<i>Participant Satisfaction</i> (S) - Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program. (Not required below the state level.)	87.0%	N.A.	85.3%		N.A.	87%

Performance Management for Continuous Improvement
Workgroup Members

Phil Degon
Employment Security Department

Evelyn Hawkins
Workforce Training and Education
Coordinating Board

James Hu
Workforce Training and Education
Coordinating Board

Mehrnaz Jamzadeh
Workforce Training and Education
Coordinating Board

Gary Kamimura
Employment Security Department

Alex Kosmides
Northwest Workforce Development Council

John Loyle
Pacific Mountain Workforce Development
Council

Sandy Miller
Employment Security Department

Margaret Nelson
Employment Security Department

Dave Pavelchek
Washington State University: Social and
Economic Sciences Research Center

David Prince
State Board for Community and Technical
Colleges

Karen Pyle
Workforce Training and Education
Coordinating Board

Patricia Stoneman Lowe
Department of Social and Health
Services/Department of Vocational
Rehabilitation

Dave Wallace
Employment Security Department

Greg Weeks
Employment Security Department

Doug Whittaker
State Board for Community and Technical
Colleges

Gena Wikstrom
Washington Federation for Private Career
Schools and Colleges

Bryan Wilson
Workforce Training and Education
Coordinating Board

Carl Wolfhagen
Workforce Training and Education
Coordinating Board